

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

YAISHA HODGES,
Plaintiff,
vs.

FREDDIE RUFUS, et al.,
Defendants

Case No. 1:18-cv-530
Barrett, J.
Litkovitz, M.J.

ORDER

Plaintiff, a resident of Cincinnati, Ohio, has filed a complaint alleging a violation of her constitutional rights.

The venue provision applicable to this action is 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), which provides that civil suits may be brought only in the judicial district where (1) any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located; (2) a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred; or (3) any defendant is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction, if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought. In this case, five of the defendants are residents of Pennsylvania and one defendant is an Ohio resident. It also appears that a substantial part of the events giving rise to plaintiff's claims occurred in the Middle District of Pennsylvania. Therefore, this case is properly venued in the Middle District of Pennsylvania as opposed to the Southern District of Ohio where this Court is located. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1333(b).

“The district court of a district in which is filed a case laying venue in the wrong division or district shall dismiss, or if it be in the interest of justice, transfer such case to any district or division in which it could have been brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). As the Southern District of Ohio is the improper venue for plaintiff's claims against the defendants, the Court shall transfer this action to the Middle District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings.

Accordingly, the Clerk of Courts is hereby **DIRECTED TO TRANSFER** this case to

the Middle District of Pennsylvania for all further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 8/1/18

Karen L. Litkovitz
Karen L. Litkovitz
United States Magistrate Judge